



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/841,149

04/23/2001

Ranjit Sahota

004572.P002

6058

26263

7590

02/17/2006

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. BOX 061080

WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER

CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/841,149	SAHOTA, RANJIT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vivek Srivastava	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao (US 6,459,427) in view of Carr (US 6,574,795).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 24 and 27 Mao discloses a system and method for integrating television content with internet content. Mao discloses a headend (fig 1) which creates an integrated video data stream by automatically integrating interactive web content received or downloaded from the world wide web 110 (see fig 1) with TV broadcast content received from analog TV source 30 or digital TV source 40 via receiver 60 (see fig 1). Mao further discloses transmitting the integrated content to a client set-top terminal 150 for display on a TV (see fig 1).

Mao fails to disclose automatically integrating interactive content with a video stream in response to one or more ATVEF triggers.

In analogous art, Carr teaches a system for providing enhancement data along with television data according to the ATVEF specification (see col. 1 lines 29 – 32).

Carr teaches "Enhancement data according to the ATVEF specification may include one

or more enhancements, with each enhancement including three components: ATVEF announcements, resources, and triggers. An announcement indicates that enhancement data is being transmitted, resources include files that contain the contents of the enhancement to be presented, and a trigger synchronizes the enhancement data with the transmission of A/V content.” Carr is evidence it would have been well known the use of ATVEF triggers is well known and it would have been obvious to modify Mao to include ATVEF triggers to provide synchronization of supplemental content according to a known standard. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed ATVEF triggers for the benefit of having a system which adheres to a well known and well established standard.

Regarding claims 2, 9, 18 and 22, Mao discloses the additional web based information is a web page about a TV commercial (see col 2 lines 65 – 67). Necessarily, the web page is advertising content.

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 25 Mao discloses the user can displaying the associated web page with the TV commercial (see col 2 lines 65 – 67) and thus discloses linking the interactive content with the TV broadcast.

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 26 Mao fails to disclose displaying the integrated content to allow a user to interact with the interactive content. Official Notice is taken it would have been well known to integrate a first content with a second interactive content for the benefit of enhancing a user’s viewing experience. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed limitation for the benefit of enhancing a user's viewing experience.

Regarding claim 5 and 12, Mao discloses transmitting the TV broadcast with web pages (see fig 1 and col. 4 lines 20 – 25). It is noted that Mao does not disclose modifying the interactive content and the TV broadcast content.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Mao fails to disclose the claimed advertising banner. Official Notice is taken it would have been well known that displaying an advertising banner both provides displaying additional information while minimizing obstruction of the primary video content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed limitation for the benefit of providing a viewer with additional information while minimizing obstructing viewing of the primary video content.

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Mao discloses providing customized and targeted integrated content (see col 2 lines 40 – 45).

Regarding claim 16, Mao discloses the user can access additional information about a commercial (see col 2 lines 63 – 65) and thus discloses the claimed limitation.

Regarding claims 17 and 21, Mao discloses the claimed set-top box 150 (see fig. 1).

Regarding claims 19 and 23, Mao discloses customizing the interactive content for specific users but fails to disclose customizing the interactive content for a specific market, group or geographic region.

Official Notice is taken targeting commercials for a specific market, group or geographic region efficiently provides targeted advertising to a larger group of people. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed limitation for the benefit of providing targeted advertising to a larger group of people thus providing a more efficient system for targeting ads.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Field et al (US 6,018,764) – One-way broadcast of internet content

Zigmond et al (US 6,571,392) – Integrating internet content with TV content

Blackletter et al (US 6,938,270) – Communicating triggers in a TV system

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (571) 272-7304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 9 am to 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272 – 7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/841,149
Art Unit: 2617

Page 7

Vs
2/12/06



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER